REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 14-29 are currently pending, with claims 1, 3, 14, 19 and 29 being the independent claims. Claim 29 has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the April 14, 2006 Office Action, independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19, and dependent claims 15 and 20-23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,595,859 ("*Lynn*"), U.S. Patent No. 5,996,011 ("*Humes*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,781,608 ("*Crawford*"). Dependent claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lynn*, *Humes*, *Crawford* and U.S. Patent No. 6,580,422 ("*Reilly*"). Dependent claims 16, 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lynn* in view of *Humes*, *Crawford* and U.S. Patent No. 6,108,637 ("*Blumenau*"). Dependent claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lynn* in view of *Humes*, *Crawford* and Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("*AAPA*"). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The Office Action (pg. 2) states:

> Lynn does not specifically teach said data is image data, and a filter for obscuring the content of only a plurality of pixels that has a metadata value that exceeds a discretionary threshold value without preventing the display of the content of the plurality of pixels that does not have a metadata value that exceeds the discretionary threshold value. However, Humes teaches a filter for blocking the content of only a plurality of pixels that has a metadata value that exceeds a discretionary threshold value without preventing the display of the content of the plurality of pixels that does not have a metadata value that exceeds the discretionary threshold value (col. 2, lines 56-63; col. 3, lines 1-8; col. 4, lines 55-58). Crawford teaches said data is image data and technique for obscuring the content of the image data (col. 1, lines 35-40).
>
> Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Humes and Crawford in the invention of Lynn in order to allow the user to download and view only the portions of the web page which are not objectionable, and to provide a blurred view of data content that is objectionable.

With respect to the foregoing, the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes* and *Crawford* fails to achieve the invention recited in independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19. *Humes* relates to a computer

based system and method for filtering text data from web pages received by a computer system connected to the Internet (see col. 1, lines 9-11). *Humes* (col. 2, lines 53-62) states, "if the web page requested by the user contains only a minimum of objectionable or target data, the user receives a portion of the filtered web page for downloading and viewing on his or her computer. While, if the web page requested contains a large amount of objectionable material, the invention will cause a 'forbidden' page to be displayed on the user's computer monitor".

Humes (col. 2, line 64 thru col. 3, line 8) teaches sequential filtering of a web page request. In particular, *Humes* (col. 2, line 64 thru col. 3, line 8) teaches filtering of the header of the web page base on whether a URL has been pre-approved or pre-denied to determine if the web page contains text data (such as HTML). *Humes* (col. 3, lines 3-8) specifically states "while the filter will decide whether or not to block access to the entire web page based on the URL, depending on its processing of the body of the web page, the filter may deny access completely to the web page, deny access to certain portions of the web page (i.e., filter out some objectionable words), or allow complete access to the web page". *Humes* (col. 4, lines 55-58) teaches that only web pages that are deemed appropriate for viewing are output to a client computer for viewing by a user of the computer. *Humes* (col. 4, lines 59-60) teaches that this filtering occurs in the manner described at col. 2, line 64 thru col. 4, line 8, relative to Figs. 2 thru 5. Thus, *Humes* teaches <u>word-based</u> and <u>text-based</u> filtering. That is, words and text are tested, and it is words and text that may be blocked by the method disclosed in *Hume*.

Crawford, on the other hand, relates to systems and techniques for displaying an image sent between subscribers of a communications system, wherein electronic data corresponding to the image is received, a blurred view of the image is displayed and a sharper version of the image is gradually displayed in response to user input (see *Abstract* and col. 1, lines 35-40). *Crawford* (col. 14, lines 26-30; Fig. 7) teaches that a client 702b gradually displays a buddy icon sent from another subscriber and provides the opportunity to accept or reject the buddy icon to reduce the danger of a subscriber viewing an objectionable image.

Crawford (col. 15, lines 35-52; Fig. 7) teaches the process associated with accepting or rejecting the buddy icon. Specifically, *Crawford* (col. 15, lines 34-35) states, "the buddy icon is a 48x48 pixel image". *Crawford* (col. 15, lines 35-36) states, "when the second client 702b receives the image data from the host 704, the second client 702b displays every eighth pixel to the second subscriber". *Crawford* (col. 15, lines 37-40) states, "when the second subscriber

selects to sharpen the view of the buddy icon, the second client 702b displays every fourth pixel to the second subscriber". Thus, *Crawford* teaches that the blurred view of the buddy icon, i.e., an image, is sharpened based on input from the second user.

Crawford (col. 15, lines 40-42) states, "if the second subscriber chooses to sharpen the view of the buddy icon again, the second client 702b displays every other pixel to the second subscriber. *Crawford* (col. 15, lines 42-45) states, "if the second subscriber again sharpens the view of the buddy icon, the second client 702b displays the clear view of the buddy icon to the second subscriber". Finally, *Crawford* (col. 15, lines 45-48) states, "if at any time, the second subscriber suspects that the buddy icon is objectionable, the second subscriber has the option to reject the buddy icon". Thus, *Crawford* teaches that a second user sharpens the resolution of an image. In addition, if the second user suspects that the image is objectionable, then he can choose to reject the image.

In contrast, the invention recited in the independent claims of the present application is directed to a system and/or method in which an integrated circuit receives and processes image data for displaying on a display. For each of the pixels shown on the display, the image data comprises both payload data (e.g., content) and metadata. The metadata comprises a value that classifies the pixel independently from the other pixels in the image data. Through this invention, the integrated circuit can perform operations on individual pixels based on their classification (as shown by their metadata). There is no pixel classification in the system achieved by the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes* and *Crawford* that is performed in the manner as claimed in the present invention.

In the present independent claims, pixels forming content that is undesirable or objectionable, such as nudity or violence, can be "obscured" from the final displayed image. The claimed invention is directed to filtering images based on a "predefined set of values which classifies a pixel independently from the other pixels". *Lynn* in combination with *Humes* and *Crawford* fails to teach the obscuring of images in this manner.

Furthermore, *Crawford* and *Humes*, either individually or in combination with *Lynn*, fail to teach or suggest that image data for each pixel has two parts: payload (comprising content) and metadata (comprising a value from a predefined set of values). Although *Humes* (col. 3, lines 50-65) teaches that individual words are provided with particular preset values when filtering, these values are found by looking up the word in a dictionary. While *Crawford* teaches blurring/obscuring of images, these images are blurred based on input from a human recipient of the

image. In contrast, the images of the claimed invention include preset values, because each individual pixel in an image is assigned one of these preset values, i.e., these values are integrated into the image data itself. *Crawford* fails to teach this claimed feature. Therefore, even when *Crawford* is combined with *Lynn* and *Humes*, an image would still be able to display objectionable content because there would be nothing to provide for obscuring pixels forming content that is undesirable or objectionable, such as nudity or violence, from the final displayed image. As a result, the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes* and *Crawford* fails to achieve the claimed invention, since *Humes* and *Crawford* fail to provide what *Lynn* lacks.

Reilly relates to a remote computer display which takes graphics primitives sent over a wireless link and converts the primitives into a graphics display (see col. 1, lines 8-11). *Reilly* fails to cure the deficiency of the system achieved by *Lynn* and *Hume*, since *Reilly* also fails to teach or suggest a system and/or method in which an integrated circuit receives and processes image data for displaying on a display, as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

Bluemenau relates to a method for monitoring the display of content by a computer system and observation of that content to provide updated and/or tailored content from a content provider site to a content display site so that the content provider's current content is always displayed at the content display site (see col. 1, lines 4-12). *Bluemenau*, however, fails to provide what the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes* and *Reilly* lacks, since *Bluemenau* also fails to teach or suggest a system and/or method in which an integrated circuit receives and processes image data for displaying on a display, as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

The Examiner has cited *AAPA* based on the failure of Lynn and/or Hume to teach that payload data comprises a red channel, a blue channel, a green channel, a Z-buffering channel and an alpha channel. However, AAPA in combination with *Lynn*, *Hume* and/or *Bluemenau* fails to teach the present invention, since *AAPA* also failed to teach or suggest the claimed system and/or method of independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19.

As a result, independent claims 1, 3, 14 and 19 are patentable over the combination of *Lynn*, *Humes*, *Bluemenau* and/or *AAPA* and therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are in order, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 29 is directed to the computer-readable medium that corresponds to independent method claim 3. Therefore, independent claim 29 is patentable over AAPA in

combination with *Lynn*, *Hume* and/or *Bluemenau* for the reasons associated with independent claim 3.

In view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 3, 14, 19, as well as new independent claim 29, for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 5, 15-18 and 20-25 are all patentable over the prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By _____

Alphonso A. Collins
Reg. No. 43,599
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: August 23, 2006